A FEW
THOUGHTS
UPON
POINTING
AND
SOME OTHER HELPS
TOWARDS
PERSPICUITY
OF
EXPRESSION.

By *J. B.* F. R. S. and F. S. A.

Printed for J. WORRALL and B. TOVEY, near *Lincoln's-Inn*.
MDCCLXVIII.

SOCIETY
BOSTON

THE

PREFACE.

AS it muſt have been almoſt impoſſible, notwithſtanding the utmoſt Care, to prevent ſome little Errors and Inaccuracies in *Pointing*, from having eſcaped the Eye and Attention of both the Compoſitor and Corrector of the Preſs, I have a Mind to add, by Way of Appendix, my Idea of *true* and *juſt* PUNCTUATION; and the rather, becauſe *moſt* Writers are (in my Opinion) too careleſs about it, and Men of the *Law*, in particular, are apt either to neglect it totally, or to execute it miſerably ill.

I once put ſome Thoughts together, upon this Subject, and communicated them to a noble and very accurate Friend. I believe that ſince his Death, they are fallen into unknown Hands: However, I have ſome rough Memorandums of them, by me. Theſe I have now reviſed, and will riſque the Publication of them; ſubject, however, to the *Correction* of better Judges.

If any Gentleman wiſhes for *further* Information upon this Subject than he ſhall meet with in this rough imperfect Eſſay, let him conſult the clear and eaſy *Interpungendi ratio*, which is added to *Ger. Jo. Voſſij Elementa Rhetorica, Londini, apud S. Tooke & B. Motte, ad Me-*

dij Templi Portam, 1724; and the *Short Introduction to Engliſh Grammar, with Critical Notes*, (the ſecond Edition, corrected,) publiſhed at *London* in 1763, and printed for *A. Millar* in the *Strand*, and *R.* and *J. Dodſley* in *Pall Mall.*

ALL that I pretend to or attempt in the following Sheets, is to try if I can convince the Reader "that "*ſome* Sort of Punctuation is abſolutely *neceſſary*." I do not pretend to lay down *certain* and *indiſputable* Rules for it. On the contrary, I agree with the learned Author of the laſt mentioned Treatiſe, "that the Doctrine "of Punctuation muſt needs be *very imperfect*;" and that "*few preciſe Rules* can be given, which will *hold* "*without Exception*, in *all* Caſes;" and "that *much* muſt "be left to the *Judgment and Taſte* of the Writer:" —And I agree with him likewiſe in this, "That we "muſt be content with the Rules of Punctuation laid "down with *as much* Exactneſs as the *Nature* of the "Subject will *admit*; ſuch as may ſerve for a *general* "Direction to be *accommodated* to different Occaſions, "and to be *ſupplied* (when deficient) by the *Writer's* "*Judgment*."

If it ſhould be aſked "Why I ſubjoin ſuch a Treatiſe "as the following, to ſuch a Work as the foregoing," my anſwer is "that I compoſed the *former* for the Uſe "of *Gentlemen*; and that *no Gentleman* ought to be al-"together inattentive to the Subject of the latter."

A FEW

THOUGHTS

UPON

POINTING &c.

THE GENERAL IDEA of POINTING is plain and obvious: The CONVENIENCE and even the NECESSITY of it I hope preſently to evince. The RULES of it may indeed admit of ſome *Latitude:* And it may not be eaſy to ſettle them with abſolute *Preciſion.*

The GENERAL *Idea of Pointing* ſeems to include nothing more than MARKING *down upon Paper*, by different Signs or Notations, the *reſpective* PAUSES which actually were or ought to be made in *pronouncing* the Words written or printed; together with like *Hints* for a *different Modulation of Voice*, where a juſt Pronunciation would require it.

As *Letters* are the Marks of *articulate Sounds*, and *Words* the Signs of *Ideas*, and *Language* the Repreſentation of *Thoughts*; ſo (I think I may venture to ſay) WRITING *and* PRINTING may be rendered Pictures of PRONUNCIATION. The *Pauſes*, the *Accents*, the *Emphaſis*, and even the *Tone of Voice* may, perhaps without much Difficulty, be noted upon Paper.

There is a certain *Propriety* and *Gracefulneſs* in all theſe, which, if a Man is himſelf Maſter of, he will be able thus to communicate to

Others: He may deſcribe them ſo well upon Paper, that his Reader may form an Idea how the Writer did or would pronounce the Words; and how the Reader may, if he pleaſes, pronounce them in the very ſame Manner.

I do not ſay "that *every* Man will make theſe Marks upon his "Paper with *Accuracy* and *Propriety*." It is not *every* Man, that *pronounces* with Accuracy and Propriety.

But every Man is ſenſible how he *himſelf* ſpeaks. He knows whether he accuſtoms himſelf to make *frequent* or only *few* Pauſes; whether he is apt to exert himſelf occaſionally with *vehement Emphaſis*, or content to drag heavily along in a *regular* Carrier's Pace; whether he ſometimes *alters* the *Tone* of his Voice, to accommodate it to the Variety of his Subject; or conſtantly perſiſts in a continued uniform *Monotony*, let his Subject vary ever ſo much.

As *every* Man is conſcious of this with regard to *himſelf*, and perfectly knows his *own* Manner of Pronouncing, he may expreſs that Manner of his *own*, ſo as to be intelligible to *another* Perſon, by *ſuitable Marks* upon Paper: And *Habit* will ſoon bring him to do this with Eaſe and Expedition; though it may, at firſt, ſeem awkward and tedious.

It may be difficult, or perhaps impoſſible to fix the *preciſe Quantity* or *Duration* of each Pauſe: "For *that* varies with the *Time*; "and the ſame Compoſition may be rehearſed in a *quicker* or a *ſlower* "Time." But the PROPORTION between the ſeveral Pauſes ſtill remains the *ſame*: "And *if* the Doctrine of Punctuation were ex-"act, the *Proportion* between the Pauſes would be ever *invari-*"*able*."

Some People indeed ſpeak rapidly; ſome, ſlowly; ſome make many Pauſes; ſome, fewer; ſome, longer; ſome, ſhorter: But this makes no Difference with regard to the *Facility of Pointing*; becauſe the PROPORTION between the Pauſes will not be thereby altered; and the whole Affair of Pointing is to *mark thoſe Proportions* upon *Paper*, conformably to the Pauſes really made and the Proportion really obſerved between them in actual Pronunciation. For Example ——The ſmalleſt Pauſe that is actually made in pronouncing is to be marked on Paper by a (,) Comma; the *next longer* Pauſe (whether it be twice as long, or more or leſs than twice,) is to be marked by a (;) Semicolon; the *next longer than that*, is to be marked by a (:) Colon; and the *next* (which finiſhes the Sentence) by a (.) full Point. The ſame might, in ſome Degree, be ſaid concerning the Diviſion of whole Groupes of Sentences into more or fewer *Paragraphs*;

graphs; and perhaps ſtill further on. *All* theſe ought to bear a *Proportion* to each other, in as near a Conformity as may be to the *Time* actually expended in the *Pauſes*, ſuppoſing the Words written or printed to be or to have been *really pronounced*.

It is very eaſy to conceive the proper Diviſion of any Compoſition into PARAGRAPHS, by allowing *Time for a Pauſe* at the Completion of each Paragraph, either *double* or *treble* or in any *greater Ratio* (if you chooſe it) to that which you allow for a Period or full Point.

The *greater* Diviſions of a large Work (into Chapters, Books &c) depend more upon the *Nature of the Subject*, than upon *Time*: And they are out of the preſent Queſtion; becauſe the Uſe and Neceſſity of *Pointing* will be exactly the ſame, and a proper Diviſion into *Paragraphs* will be equally convenient, whether theſe larger Diviſions be reducible to any Rule, or not.

But a Diviſion into *Paragraphs* may be well enough taken in, under the Term "*Pointing*," in its large and more extenſive Senſe: And the Practice of it is very convenient in keeping both Writer and Reader clear from Perplexity and Confuſion. Under this larger and more extenſive Meaning of the Word "*Pointing*," may alſo be taken in, the Marks of *Accents*, of *long and ſhort* Syllables, of *Emphaſis*, or *other* Alteration of Voice.

It muſt be admitted, indeed, that Pointing can not be inſiſted on as *abſolutely neceſſary*, in this *large* Senſe of the Word; however *convenient* it may be. But in the more *confined* Senſe of it, there is *no* Need to make any ſuch Conceſſion: For, as far as *ſtrict* Pointing or *Inter*punctuation goes, it is a great deal *more* than *barely* convenient.

THE CONVENIENCE, I may ſay THE NECESSITY of Interpunctuation, in order to prevent Ambiguity and aſſiſt Perſpicuity, is ſo obvious, that it ſeems needleſs to enlarge much upon it.

Every School-boy is furniſhed with evaſive Anſwers of Oracles, wherein the different diſpoſition of the Points not only rendered the Senſe *ambiguous*, but was ſometimes capable of giving it *two directly contrary* Meanings. In other Inſtances, groſs apparent *Falſehoods* may be changed into very ſimple *Truths*, and ſimple *Truth* into groſs *Falſehood*, by the mere Alteration of the Places of the Points. So that the ſame *identical* Words may be either *undeniably true*, or *exceedingly doubtful*, or *abſurdly falſe*, juſt as they happen to be pointed, or as the Points may be changed from one Place to another: And it often happens in Fact, that great Confuſion and Uncertainty does

ariſe from wrong Pointing, or from the total Neglect of uſing any Points at all. This *alone* ſeems to prove the Neceſſity of paying *ſome* Attention to Punctuation.

I know, there are ſome *Perſons* who affect to *deſpiſe* it, and treat this whole Subject with the utmoſt *Contempt*, as a Trifle far below *their* Notice, and a Formality unworthy of *their* Regard: They do not hold it difficult, but *deſpicable*; and neglect it, as being *above* it.

Yet many ingenious and elegant Writers have condeſcended to point their Works with Care: And very eminent Scholars have not diſdained to teach the Method of doing it with Propriety. It certainly helps the Writer to explain himſelf more intelligibly; and the Reader, to apprehend more readily. In *many* Caſes, it is abſolutely neceſſary that a Writing ſhould be pointed, in order to its being underſtood *at all*; and in *others*, to prevent its being *miſ*underſtood. Very *long* Writings ſtand moſt in Need of its Aſſiſtance: And yet it ſo happens in Fact, that the *longeſt of all* are generally (if not univerſally) altogether *un*-pointed. The Original Record of a long Act of Parliament, or a verboſe Deed of Conveyance or Marriage-Settlement, engroſſed upon many Skins of Parchment without a ſingle Point from Beginning to End, may be nearly as unintelligible to a Common Reader, as if they were compoſed in an unknown Language.

As the Senſe may be *varied* or even *reverſed* by *falſe* Pointing, ſo it may be rendered *doubtful* by *no* Pointing at all.

The two following Inſtances, though very trite ones, are nevertheleſs *deciſive* "that the Senſe may be abſolutely *reverſed* by diffe-"rent Pointing;" and *fatally* too.

"*Ibis*; *Redibis*: *Nunquam per bella peribis*."
"*Ibis*; *Redibis nunquam*: *Per bella peribis*."

"*Edouardum occidere noli*: *Timere bonum eſt*."
"*Edouardum occidere noli timere*: *bonum eſt*."

So the Senſe may be ridiculouſly *perverted* by falſe Pointing.

"Every Lady in this Land
"Hath *twenty* Nails on *each* Hand;
"*Five and twenty* on Hands *and Feet*:
"And this is *true*, without Deceit."

And

And *ſo it is*; and *not only true*, but even a *clear, obvious, undeniable Truth*, when the Sentence is properly pointed: Though the *Aſſertion is falſe*, and the *Computation erroneous*, if pointed as above.

CHANGE the Pointing: And what can be more *ſimply true*, than both Aſſertion and Computation?

" Every Lady in this Land
" Hath *twenty* Nails; on each Hand
" *Five*; and twenty on Hands *and* Feet:
" And this is true, without Deceit."

There is not a Grain of Deceit or Fallacy in the WORDS: *All* that is *equivocal*, lies *ſolely* in the PUNCTUATION.

POINTING therefore, ſtrictly and properly ſo called, ſeems to be abſolutely *neceſſary*; at leaſt, *exceedingly* convenient and uſeful.

A proper Diviſion into *Paragraphs* has alſo it's Uſe and Beauty; as has been already *ſaid*, if not *ſhewn*.

Many *other Diſtinctions* tend greatly to Perſpicuity: *Great Letters* properly applied; *Under-ſcoring*, in Writing; *Italics, Capitals &c*, in printed Books; and in ſhort, *every* Artifice that can be invented, to lead the Readers Apprehenſion into the Track of the Writer's Meaning. And if a Writer finds himſelf a little hard-bound now and then, and not eaſily delivered of his *own* Meaning, he will eaſily conceive how ſerviceable it muſt be to his Reader, to furniſh him with *any* Clew to guide him through the mazy Labyrinth.

I will not aſſert, nor do I pretend " that *my* Manner of Pointing " and diſtinguiſhing is preferable to any *other*:" But *this* I will aſ- " ſert, that it is much *better* than *none at all*;" and " that it ſerves, " in a *greater* or *leſs* Degree, to *aſſiſt* the Apprehenſion of the Rea- " der."

Any Gentleman who has the old Law-Reports in his Study, (ſuch as the *Year-Books*, *Plowden*, *Leonard*, *Roll &c*,) may eaſily try it: And he will ſoon perceive the great Inconvenience of a *total* Neglect of all Diſtinctions whatſoever; and will *feel* it very *irkſomely*, if he has a real Occaſion to look into thoſe Books for particular Paſſages cited out of them; eſpecially, if he happens to be preſſed in Point of Time. Inſtead of any guiding Marks or Diſtinctions which may conduct his Eye to the Paſſage ſought for, or to the Part of the Caſe where he would be likely to find it, or even to the Name of the Judge or Counſel who ſpoke the Words, he will ſee a Report of the Length of ſeveral Pages, all huddled together in *one ſingle Paragraph*,

graph, without any Diſtinction between the State of the Caſe, the Arguments of a Variety of Counſel, the reſpective Opinions of the ſeveral Judges, and the final Reſolution of the Court: And he will ſcarce think the Matter much exaggerated, if it ſhould be compared to the actual Search for a Needle in a Bottle of Hay. It is more unpleaſant and dilatory than can well be conceived by a Perſon who has never had Occaſion to try it.

I will conclude this Head with an *Experimentum Crucis*, by referring, in general, to ancient Manuſcripts and ancient Marbles; (Inſtances of which may be ſeen in *Gruter*, or the *Marmor Sandvicenſe*;) or even to the famous *Alexandrian* Manuſcript, atteſted by the Patriarch *Cyril*, which has the Diviſions into Paragraphs, and is in ſome Degree punctuated. Let any Gentleman of the common ordinary Degree of Scholarſhip and Skill in *Greek*, but not particularly converſant with old Manuſcripts, try "*how currently* he can read and "underſtand them;" or, in plain and direct Terms, "whether he "can, without great Labour and Study, underſtand them *at all*." I am very ſure that he will not venture to ſay "that he could read "them *as* currently and *as* pleaſantly, as if they had been pointed "and diſtinguiſhed in the Manner before recommended." I would venture to ſay that it might probably coſt him ten Minutes or a Quarter of an Hour, after the Book was fairly laid open before him, to determine whether he did or did not find in the laſt mentioned Manuſcript, the litigated Paſſage in St. *John*'s Goſpel.

This is ſo ſtrong an Inſtance, that I will not attempt to add any Thing further; unleſs any Perſon of ordinary Skill in the *Hebrew* Language is willing to accept the like Appeal to *him*, with Regard to the moſt ſacred Copy of the *Jewiſh* Law: *Conſtans enim et antiquiſſima eſt Rabbinorum Sententia*, "*legem a* Moſe *ſcriptam eſſe ſine* "*punctis* [*Vowel* Points] *ſine accentibus, ſine paraſchis, ſine verſuum,* "*imo ſine verborum diſtinctione.*"

I hope it now appears, that Pointing and every other Diſtinction that is likely to catch the Reader's Eye and ſtrike his Attention, are *contributory* towards rendering any *written or printed* Compoſition *more clearly and readily apprehended* by its Reader; and *deſerve* therefore to be *cultivated* and *improved*, rather than deſpiſed and ſcorned.

THIS is the main Point I have had in View: And the Deſire of eſtabliſhing it has been the Ground of this preſent Attempt.

IF

If the *Uſe* and *Expediency* of Pointing and other aſſiſtant Diſtinctions be granted, it would ſurely be very deſirable to fix ſome general Rules, if they can be agreed upon, for the beſt and propereſt Manner of *practiſing* ſo uſeful and convenient an Art. And though it is hardly to be expected that *all* Men will agree in *one Opinion* about ſuch *beſt* and *propereſt* Method, yet there can be no Harm in throwing out a few Hints upon a Subject ſo little regarded. And as nothing more is hereby intended, than to collect a few Hints and Materials towards ſome *future* Eſtabliſhment, it is not at all neceſſary to be nice or exact in the putting them together at preſent: Therefore they ſhall be freely propoſed, and in the Order wherein they happen to occur.

But I ſhould, in the firſt Place, refer thoſe of my Readers who would be as accurate in Pointing as the Rules hitherto laid down can render them, to the two excellent Treatiſes which I mentioned at firſt ſetting out. The two learned Authors of them form their Rules upon the Nature of Sentences as divided into principal conſtructive Parts, and the Degrees of Connexion between thoſe Parts: And they diſtinguiſh between imperfect Phraſes, ſimple Sentences, and compound Sentences. They conſider, in a Sentence, the *Subject* and the *Verb*; and each as accompanied with ſeveral *Adjuncts*, as the Object, the End, the Circumſtances (of Time Place Manner and the like;) and *that*, either immediately, or *mediately*, that is, by being connected with ſomething that is connected with ſome other, and ſo on. And they hold "that if there are ſeveral Subjects "belonging in the ſame Manner to one Verb, or ſeveral Verbs be- "longing in the ſame Manner to one Subject, the Subjects and Verbs "are ſtill to be accounted equal in Number; for every Verb muſt "have its Subject, and every Subject its Verb; and every one of the "Subjects, or Verbs, ſhould or may have its Point of Diſtinction." They *Both* give *Examples* to illuſtrate their Rules: The Profeſſor, in *Latin*; the Biſhop, in *Engliſh*. But as I may injure them by attempting to repreſent what they have expreſſed in the cleareſt Terms, it is ſafer and better to refer the Reader to receive their Inſtructions from *themſelves*. He will find great Entertainment and Improvement from the Treatiſe *de ratione interpungendi*, from Page 50 to Page 82; and in the *Introduction to Engliſh Grammar*, from Page 170 to Page 183. Whoever will take the Pains to conſult and conſider what they may there find, will be amply rewarded for their Trouble. They may alſo find clear and conciſe Information of the

ſame Kind, in *Mr. Chambers's Cyclopædia*, under the Article "Sen-" tence in Grammar."

But as *Others* may chooſe to take the Matter up more *ſlightly*, and conſider it only in a *general* View, without entering into the Niceties of the Subject, or caring to incumber themſelves with particular Rules requiring a conſiderable Degree of Attention; it might in ſome Meaſure anſwer *their* Purpoſe, or at leaſt help them a little, if they would only habituate themſelves to *pronounce aloud* the Words they have been writing down; and then point them. I imagine, that after a little Habit and Exercitation of this Kind, they would learn how to point them, to a *uſeful* Degree. For *Nature*, joined to Cuſtom, teaches them to make *ſome* Pauſes, when they *ſpeak* or *read*: And they would have nothing to do, but to put down upon their written Paper ſuch a Mark as will *there* expreſs the *ſame* Quantity of Pauſe which they find themſelves *actually to make* in reading aloud their own written Words. Though this Method may not bring a Man to a quite *correct* Manner of Pointing, yet it will bring him to a *conſiſtent* one: He will point *as* he ſpeaks; and *if* his Manner of Speaking or Reading be juſt and proper with Regard to his Pauſes, his Manner of Pointing will be ſo too, or at leaſt come very near it.

It is not to be expected, that *all* Men ſhould point *alike:* For, all Men do not *ſpeak* alike, or *read* alike. Beſides, the *Subject-Matter* ſpoken or written by *one* Perſon may induce him to pauſe and point differently from *another*; or even differently from his *own* Manner of Pauſing and Pointing in treating a *different Subject*. Grave, ſerious, abſtruſe, argumentative, mathematical, theological Orations, Lectures, or Writings ought to be *higher* pointed (that is to ſay, divided into more Members) than ludicrous, light, lively, facetious Pieces of mere Wit and Humour: Becauſe the former are, in their own Nature, more difficult to be immediately apprehended and underſtood; whereas the latter muſt be very bad of their Kind, if they do not ſtrike the Apprehenſion at once, *without* any ſupplemental Aid.

Neither is it to be expected, that *all* Perſons ſhould point *properly:* Becauſe numberleſs private and even public Speakers and Readers make their *Pauſes* very IM*properly*. Yet I think that every one that ſufficiently endeavours at it, may point *as he himſelf* ſpeaks or reads. If he does not, he ought to infer from thence, "that he "does *either* the one or the other *improperly:*" And he ought to

continue

continue his Endeavours, *till* he can bring each to be *conſiſtent* with the other.

As to the NUMBER *of Diſtinctions*—Dr. *Ward* ſeems to think that *more* than are commonly admitted in ordinary Practice, might be *uſeful:* He expreſsly ſpecifices "One, *greater* than the *Colon*;" and judges ſuch a one to be wanting "*in longioribus quibuſdam ſen-*" *tijs.*"

The Right Reverend Author does not ſeem to come into this Opinion. He obſerves that "the different Degrees of Connexion "between the ſeveral Parts of Sentences, and the different Pauſes in "a juſt Pronunciation, which expreſs thoſe Degrees of Connexion "according to their proper Value, admit of great Variety; but the "whole Number of Points which we have to *expreſs* their Variety, "amounts only to *Four*. Hence it is, that we are under a Ne-"ceſſity of expreſſing Pauſes of the *ſame* Quantity, on different "Occaſions, by *different* Points; and more frequently of expreſſing "Pauſes of *different* Quantity by the *ſame* Points." But yet he thinks "that if a greater Number of Marks were invented, to ex-"preſs all the poſſible different Pauſes of Pronunciation; the Doc-"trine of them would be very *perplexed* and *difficult*, and the Uſe "of them would rather *embaraſs* than aſſiſt the Reader."

He obſerves "that the ſeveral Degrees of Connection between "Sentences, and between their principal and conſtructive Parts, "Rhetoricians have conſidered under the following Diſtinctions, "as the moſt obvious and remarkable; the *Period*, *Colon*, *Semico-*"*lon*, and *Comma:*" And, after having defined theſe four, he adds, that "the Grammarians have followed this Diviſion of the Rheto-"ricians, and have appropriated to each of theſe Diſtinctions its "Mark or Point; which takes its Name from the Part of the Sen-"tence which it is employed to diſtinguiſh;

"The Period "The Colon "The Semicolon "The Comma	} thus marked	} : ; ,

The Biſhop entirely drops Dr. *Ward*'s *Semiperiod:* He does not even mention it. Indeed, the Profeſſor himſelf does not greatly inſiſt upon it. All that he ſays of it is this——"SEMIPERIODUS "*inter colon et periodum, ut ſemicolon inter comma et colon, mediam*

"*habere*

" *habere poteſtatem dicitur. Sententiam igitur perfectam terminat;*
" *ſed cui nova ex ſe nata annectitur, quæ a litera minuſcula incipit.*"
Then he gives three Examples of it; one from *Salluſt*, and two from *Cicero*. He then proceeds thus——" *Cum hujuſce autem di-*
" *ſtinctionis uſus illi, quem colo proxime tribuimus valde affinis videa-*
" *tur; nonnulli in* eo *diſcrimen poſuerunt, quaſi tum demum ſemiperi-*
" *odo locus ſit, quum ſenſus poſterior a priori dependeat, ſed copula*
" *non connectatur.*" And this Difference will appear clear enough, he ſays, by comparing the three Examples he has given of the Semiperiod, with the Examples which he has given of the Colon. He concludes with obſerving " that thoſe who do not uſe the Semipe-
" riod, *ſometimes* ſubſtitute the *Colon* in its Place, and *ſometimes* the
" *Period.*"

Upon the whole of what he has ſaid concerning the Semiperiod, I acknowledge that I can find no more in it, than what exactly " anſwers to my Idea of the ſtrict and proper COLON; except the *Mark* by which he diſtinguiſhes it, namely, beginning the *new* Sentence ariſing out of and annexed to the preceding perfect Sentence, with a *ſmall Letter*.

IT is unneceſſary to ſpend Time in defining or explaining the four Diſtinctions called *Period*, *Colon*, *Semicolon* and *Comma*; becauſe that is very well done already, in a Book that is or ought to be in every One's Hands: I mean *Mr. Chambers's Cyclopædia*. There you will find every Thing relating to them or to the Uſe of them, that can well be ſaid or thought of, laid down in the moſt inſtructive and entertaining Manner, under the four *reſpective* Articles; and amongſt the Reſt, the Sentiments of Dr. *Ward* and Father *Buffier*, very clearly repreſented. (The *Biſhop*'s Book was not publiſhed till many Years after Mr. *Chambers*'s Death: The firſt Edition of it was in 1762.) It might therefore ſuffice, and perhaps might be more prudent, to leave the Matter here, upon a general Reference to what theſe Gentlemen (including the Biſhop) have ſaid upon the Subject. Yet I feel an Inclination to expatiate a little, though perhaps more whimſically than judiciouſly, upon the Uſe of the *Colon*.

Under the Article " COLON, " Mr. *Chambers* mentions the Uſes which ſeveral different Grammarians have aſſigned to it. *Some* ſay, " marking the *Middle* of a Period: " *Others* ſay, " concluding a " *ſenſe leſs perfect than the period.*" *Others* ſay " that it is to be " uſed, when the *Senſe is perfect*, but the *Sentence not concluded.*" " *F. Buffier*," he ſays, " has *attempted to fix* the Uſe of it; but " does

" does not much diſtinguiſh it from the *Semicolon.*" As to the Occaſions where the *Colon* is to be uſed, rather than the *Semicolon*, Mr. *Chambers* himſelf ſays " there is *nothing preciſe* to be ſaid of it; ex-" cept that the Colon ſhews the ſupernumerary Member more de-" tached, and ſets it at a greater Diſtance from the reſt; and therefore " marks a longer Pauſe than the Semicolon." He ſays " that the " *Colon* ſeems *preferable* to the *Semicolon*, before Conjunctions ad-" verſative, reſtrictive, conditional *&c:* But where the ſupernume-" rary Phraſes not only ſuppoſe the Precedent, but *depend* on them " for their *Regimen*, and are, as it were, *new Parts* thereof, there " the *Semicolon* ſeems *preferable* to the *Colon.*" Yet he owns " that " this Difference has a Dependence on ſomething that influences *all* " the Points, and ſways the *whole Doctrine* of Punctuation; *viz.* " the *Length* or *Shortneſs* of the *Members and Periods:* For when " the Phraſes are *long*, we point *higher* than when ſhort." ALL this ſeems very rational. Yet *one* of his Examples might, I think, admit of a different Pointing from what he aſſigns to it. He points it thus——" The Diſcourſe conſiſted of two Parts; in the firſt was " ſhewn the Neceſſity of Fighting; in the ſecond, the Advantages " that would redound from it." I ſhould have written it and pointed it, thus——The Diſcourſe conſiſted of *two* Parts: In the *firſt*, was ſhewn the *Neceſſity* of fighting; in the *ſecond*, the *Advantages* that would redound from it.

I have already ſaid, that my *own* Notion of the ſtrict and proper *Colon* falls in the with Dr. *Ward's Semiperiod:* It is to be placed at the End of a perfect Sentence, to which a new one, ariſing out of it, is annexed. This Notion of a Colon falls in alſo with the Biſhop's: His Words are——" A Member of a Sentence, whether " ſimple or compounded, which *of itſelf* would make a *complete* " *Sentence*, and ſo requires a greater Pauſe than a Semicolon, yet is " followed by an additional Part making a more full and perfect " Senſe, may be diſtinguiſhed by a COLON." But notwithſtanding theſe two great Authorities, I never uſe more than *one* Colon in the *ſame* Period. *They* admit *three* or *four* into the ſame Period. *If* the Uſe of a Colon is to mark the *Middle* of a Period, there certainly can be *but one Middle* in the ſame Period: Or if it marks a Semiperiod, there can be but two *Semiperiods* in one Period.

I would juſt obſerve here, that theſe two learned Writers do not quite agree in the Proportions between the Pauſes: Nor is it eſſential, that they ſhould do ſo, with *abſolute Preciſion.* The *Profeſſor's*

ſor's Ratio is this——" *In commate ſuſpenſio vocis duplo longior eſſe* " *debet, quam inter alia vocabula, quæ nulla diſtinctione ſeparantur;* " *in Semicolo* triplo; *et* ſimiliter *in reliquis majoribus interpunctis,* " eadem *proportione ſervata.*" The *Biſhop*'s is this——" The pro- " portional Quantity or Time of the Points with reſpect to one " another is determined by the following general Rule: The Period " is a Pauſe in Quantity or Duration *double* of the Colon; the Colon " is *double* of the Semicolon; and the Semicolon is *double* of the " Comma. So that they are in the *ſame* Proportion to one another " as the Semibrief, the Minim, the Crotchet, and the Quaver, in " Muſic."

Probably, many Perſons may uſe additional Points or Diſtinctions, of their own Invention, in their *private* Studies, to aſſiſt their *own* Apprehenſion or Recollection; though they may not adventure to produce them to the *Public*, becauſe they would not be generally underſtood. For, theſe Diſtinctions ſeem, in this Reſpect, to bear ſome Reſemblance to *Short-hand*; where every Man is at Liberty to *invent for himſelf*, and to contrive ſuch peculiar Characters for his own *private* Uſe, as he finds beſt adapted to his own Conception and Memory.

Upon the whole of what has been ſaid concerning the Number of theſe Diſtinctions; and more eſpecially, as the two learned and ingenious Writers whom I have ſo often referred to, are not quite agreed either as to the Number *commonly* uſed, or whether it would or would not be deſirable to *increaſe* it; we may venture to conclude " that the *Number* of them is ARBITRARY." From whence it ſeems to follow, that every Man is at Liberty to form his own Sentiments about them; and can do no *Harm*, by communicating them to others.

Perhaps the *Comma*, *Semicolon*, *Colon*, and *Period* may be the whole Number of thoſe Diſtinctions which may *ſtrictly and properly* be called Points. The *Semiperiod* has *no* diſtinct Mark or Notation from that of the Period: It is not at all pretended to be marked *by* the Point, but *by* quite *another* Diſtinction, namely, beginning the Twin-Sentence (if I may ſo call it) with a *ſmall Letter*.

Yet *ſome other* Marks of proper Pauſes may be advantageouſly uſed. The *Break* marked thus (———) is often very expreſſive: And it ſeems a better Introduction to a Speech or Quotation, than the *Colon*; which, the Biſhop ſays "is commonly uſed, when an Ex- " ample or a Speech is introduced." This Mark ——— is very fre-

quently uſed by the late ingenious and accurate Dr. *Byrom*, (who had examined the Nature and Properties of our Language with the moſt diligent Attention, and wrote it with a moſt maſterly Pen,) in his Treatiſe introductory to the Plan of his very ſagacious and uſeful Invention of a univerſal *Engliſh* Short-Hand, lately communicated to the Public. So, a Writer may leave *proportionally* larger or ſmaller *Spaces* between his Sentences, as the Pronunciation may require longer or ſhorter Pauſes: Or he may divide his Matter into longer or ſhorter Members.

The PAUSES do not, as I ſhould conceive, depend *ſolely* on the *Quantity* of *Words* or even of *Members* in a Sentence; but ſeem to be at leaſt *as much*, if not *more* influenced by the *Subject-Matter*. Sometimes the greateſt Pauſes are graceful, after the ſmalleſt Quantity of Words: As, "to die—to ſleep———to ſleep?——per-"chance to dream———: For—in that Sleep of Death, what "Dreams may come," *&c.*

BESIDES the *Points* which mark the *Pauſes*, there are *others* which can ſcarce be ranked under the Title of "*Diſtinctioni of Sentences*:". Dr. *Ward* calls them "*Notæ Affectuum.*" The learned Prelate gives them no particular Name: He only ſays that "they denote a "different Modulation of the Voice in Correſpondence with the "Senſe." The Profeſſor mentions only *two*, namely *Quæſtio* and *Exclamatio:* The Biſhop mentions *three*, namely "The *Interroga-*"*tion Point*, the *Exclamation Point*, the *Parentheſis.*" Both theſe Writers indeed conſider them all as *Points*. The Profeſſor ſays—— "INTERPUNCTORUM alia *ſententias et partes illarum diſtinguunt*, "alia *ſignant affectus:*" And after he has ſpecified the Comma, the Semicolon, the Colon, the *Semiperiodus*, and the *Periodus*, as the *Sententiarum diſtinctiones*, he ſays—"*His adjungi poſſunt* Paren-"theſis, Paratheſis." Then, under a third Diviſion, he ſays—— "Affectuum *Notæ ſunt* Quæſtio, Exclamatio." He agrees with the Biſhop in their denoting a *different Modulation of the Voice:* He ſays——"QUÆSTIONIS Nota *vocem ſuſpendit:* EXCLAMATIONIS "*Nota vocem ob motum animi vehementiorem* altius *tollendam eſſe mo-*"*net.*" The *latter* is uſed, he ſays, to expreſs *various* Affections; *each* of which might perhaps ſeem to *deſerve* a particular diſtinct Mark (*peculiare ſignum*) if it could be conveniently ſo contrived: And he gives ſeveral Examples (from *Tully*) of ſeveral different Kinds of Exclamation at preſent evpreſſed by the *ſame* Mark; *viz. Admiration*, *Wiſhing*, *Grief*, *Pity*, *Indignation*, *Contempt*, and *Sneer*.

The Biſhop contents himſelf with ſaying no more, upon the whole Subject, than *this*; (which is ſo conciſe and ſo clear, that I will tranſcribe it *all*;)—"The *Interrogation* and *Exclamation* Points "are ſufficiently explained by their *Names:* They are indeterminate "as to their Quantity or Time, and may be equivalent in that Re- "ſpect to a Semicolon, a Colon, or a Period, as the Senſe requires. "They mark an Elevation of the Voice.

"The *Parentheſis* incloſes in the Body of a Sentence a Member "inſerted into it, which is neither neceſſary to the Senſe, nor at all "affects the Conſtruction. It marks a moderate Depreſſion of the "Voice, with a Pauſe greater than a Comma."

This is the whole that his Lordſhip has given upon theſe three Diſtinctions, the Interrogation, Exclamation, and Parentheſis.

The PARENTHESIS is of great Uſe, and tends, in my Apprehenſion, *very much* to Perſpicuity.

The PARATHESIS alſo (which the Biſhop does not mention) is *not without* its Convenience.

A PARENTHESIS is, what includes a Member of a Sentence or an Intercalation introduced into it, capable of being either inſerted or omitted without affecting either its Senſe or its grammatical Conſtruction; and yet tending to its Explanation or Elucidation. What is contained within it ought never to *obſcure* the Sentence into which it is introduced; but, on the contrary, ſhould ſerve either to clear up and enlighten, or to add Force and Strength to it. Conſequently, it ſhould never be *long* and *tedious:* IF it requires *Length*, it ought to be formed into a *diſtinct ſeparate* Sentence; or elſe converted into a *marginal Note*.

Neither is the *too frequent* Uſe of Parentheſes to be approved of. The Mind of the Hearer or Reader is thereby put too often in Suſpenſe: Which is unpleaſant and diſagreeable. A *long* Parentheſis generally keeps it *tediouſly* in Suſpenſe, and *embarraſſes* the Senſe: And even *ſhort* ones may have a like Effect, in *ſome Degree*, by their *too frequent* Occurrence.

To put one Parentheſis *within* another, is a great Fault in Language: But. to *begin* a Parentheſis *only*; and then (within that) to *begin another*; and never to *end* either; is a much greater. And yet the Meaning of a great Judge (many of whoſe ſenſible and ſolid Opinions I have endeavoured to repreſent) was *ſometimes* obſcured by the latter Incorrectneſs of his Language. Indeed the Juſtneſs of his Sentiments was *always* much ſuperior to the *Language* in which he conveyed them.

Some

Some lay it down as a Rule, "that a Sentence ſhould *never end* "with a *Parentheſis.*" But, I own, I can not ſee ſufficient Ground forſuch a Prohibition.

It is a modern Faſhion, but ſurely a very *bad* one, to *omit the* MARK of a Parentheſis: And *ſome* have ſaid "that a Parentheſis is "*as well* diſtinguiſhed by *Commas* placed at the Beginning and End "of it, or by a *double Colon*, as by its uſual Mark ( )." But this is not true, in Fact. The former expedient is *no* Diſtinction of a Parentheſis, at all: The latter is *worſe than none*; and can only ſerve to puzzle and confound the Senſe. For, as *Colons* often occur, and *Commas* preſent themſelves perpetually, *how* is the Reader to diſtinguiſh, WHEN a Colon or a Comma ſtands for the MARK *of a Parentheſis*, and WHEN it only repreſents its reſpective ordinary Pauſe? It ſeems manifeſt to me, that he has *no* Rule whereby to make this Diſtinction. But *if* he ſhould be ſuppoſed to have *any at all*, it can be but a very *doubtful*, *difficult*, and *uncertain* one: And why ſhould a *plain obvious infallible* Diſtinction be DESERTED, in favour of what is either *none at all* or *next to none?* And why ſhould not a Parentheſis be *marked* in *Writing* or in *Print*, as well as in SPEAKING? Every Man that ſpeaks with Propriety *marks* the *ſpoken* Contents of a Parentheſis, by an *Alteration* of the Tone of his Voice? And therefore it ought likewiſe to be *marked* upon Paper, in order to render Writing or Printing a juſt Repreſentation of Pronouncing. And of this Opinion was the learned Profeſſor Dr. *Ward*; who gives *this* as the expreſs Reaſon why it ought to be marked with its proper Mark;—"*Ob quam Cauſam* ſane *propria nota* ſignari debent." It is ſufficient for my Purpoſe, if I can ſhew "that the Voice is or "ought to be ALTERED, in pronouncing the Contents of a Paren-"theſis:" It is not incumbent on me to ſpecify the exact *Degree* "of ſuch Alteration. However, the general Rule ſeems to be "by "a *moderate Depreſſion* of it." VOSSIUS ſays expreſsly, "*voce plu-*"*rimum magis ſubmiſſa:*" And Dr. *Ward* ſeems to agree to this; though his *own direct Words* are only "ALITER *efferantur.*" The beforementioned learned and Right Reverend Author ſays "A Pa-"rentheſis marks a *moderate Depreſſion* of Voice, with a Pauſe "*greater* than a Comma:" Which, by the Way, does not agree with the Practice of thoſe who only mark it *by* a Comma.

I obſerve, with great Satisfaction, that ſo very accurate a Writer as the late learned Inventor of the Short-Hand, applicable to any other Language, but particularly adjuſted to our own, has, in the

beforementioned Treatiſe which introduces and explains it, not only diſtinguiſhed his Parentheſes by *adding their proper Marks*, but has alſo *ſuperadded* the reſpective proper *Commas* and *Semicolons* at the End of them; a Practice which, though often neglected, ſeems both proper and neceſſary, and receives great Support from ſo reſpectable an Authority. It may likewiſe be noted, that this Writer's Admiſſion of a *Semicolon* at the End of a Parentheſis is *another* Contradiction to the Practice of thoſe who *only* mark a Parentheſis by a *Comma*.

A PARATHESIS includes a *very few* Words which are certainly *no Member* of the Sentence, nor neceſſarily connected with the Senſe or Grammar of it; being, ſometimes, the Words of a *different Perſon* from the *Compoſer* of the Sentence; *viz.* the Words of the Perſon who is *repeating* or *citing* it. It is always merely *exegetical* [explanatory.]

Dr. *Ward* ſays, the *Uſe* of it is "*haud admodum frequens:*" And he illuſtrates it from a Paſſage in *Cicero*——"*Cujus* [Periclis] *in* "*labris veteres Comici leporem habitaſſe dixerunt.*" *V. Lib. de Orat.* iii. 138.

The Biſhop takes *no* Notice at all of it.

I take one ſpecial Uſe of it to be *this*——That when a Speaker is repeating, or a Writer citing the Words of *another* Perſon; and finds that his *adding* a ſingle Word, or two or three Words of his *own*, will be neceſſary or convenient towards aſcertaining any equivocal Term or Expreſſion, or clearing up any Doubt; he puts theſe *added Words of his own* within a PARATHESIS, if he is Writing, or *lowers his Voice*, if he is ſpeaking them; in order to ſhew that they are *not* the *original* Words of his *Author*, but *additional* explanatory Words of his *own*. This I apprehend to be the uſual *Office* of a *Paratheſis*.

It is marked by Hooks or Brackets or Crotchets, thus [ ]. Theſe diſtinguiſh it from the Parentheſis, which has a diſtinct Uſe and Office; and the Words contained in it are always the Words of the original Compoſer of the Sentence.

IF more than two or three or a very few Words are requiſite for ſuch an Eclairciſſement, they ought to be placed in the Margin, as a *marginal Note*. In *moſt* Caſes, they are *as well*, perhaps *better* in the *Margin*, than in the *Text*.

Nevertheleſs, a *Paratheſis*, containing only two or three Words, may *ſometimes* be well enough admitted into the *Text:* As—"They

[meaning the *French*] "marched precipitately &c." Dr. *Prieſtley*'s Rudiments of *Engliſh* Grammar 1768. pa. 83. "Who [meaning the King] "notwithſtanding he relates &c." *Idem*, pa. 84. So, in the foregoing Pages, whenever I have cited the Orders of Seſſions *verbatim*, and they are worded—"*This Court* is of Opinion &c," I have always added a Paratheſis [of Seſſions] or [the Court of Seſſions] in order to ſecure the Reader from *miſtaking the Court* whoſe Opinion it is, and to prevent him from imagining it to be the Opinion of the Court of *King's Bench*, whoſe Deciſions I am profeſſedly communicating to him. So, in the Appeal to *Hebricians*, in Page 638 of this little Eſſay, in ſpeaking of the Opinion of the *Rabbins*, "That the Law written by *Moſes* was *without Points*, I have inſerted [*Vowel*-Points] to prevent the Word "*punctis*" (which there means the *Maſoretic* Points) from being miſunderſtood to mean *ſuch* Points as are the Subject of my preſent Paper; two quite different Things, though called by the ſame Name.

To the *Parentheſis* and *Paratheſis* may be added the *Mark* of QUOTATION " ". And by the ſame Mark " " may be diſtinguiſhed (what is in its Nature very like to a Quotation, and may almoſt be conſidered as ſuch,) the *Terms* of a QUESTION to be debated, or of a PROPOSITION aſſerted or denied. Such a Manner of marking out the Terms of a Queſtion or Propoſition greatly aſſiſts the Eye in diſtinguiſhing it at once from the Context, without any troubleſome Attention or any Loſs of Time.

The HYPHEN (marked -) is alſo very proper to ſhew the Conjunction of two or more Words ſo connected and compounded together as not perfectly to coaleſce, yet to form *almoſt* though not quite *one* Word.

The Duplication of the ſame Mark (=) is uſed, to connect the *diſcontinued Syllables* of a Polyſyllable, ſeparated from each other by the Diſtance of a whole Line's Length, for want of Room to finiſh the Word within the End of the former Line; and it becoming therefore neceſſary to complete it upon a new one.

SCORING under material and emphatical Words (or even *double* or *treble* Scoring;) and *Italics*, *Capitals*, and *greater Capitals*, are of infinite Uſe, to aſſiſt the *Recollection* of the *Writer*, to catch the *Apprehenſion* of the *Reader*, and to direct the *Pronunciation* of the *Speaker*.

This Liſt of Diſtinctions is ſomewhat larger than Doctor *Ward*'s. I do not pretend to preſcribe it to others: I know, it has been uſe-

ful

ful to myſelf. So alſo have ſome *occaſional* Marks, ſerving (as it ſeemed to me) to aſſiſt Perſpicuity, and to aſk particular Attention to ſuch Words or Paſſages as might be thought moſt to deſerve it. I think that large initial Letters, properly uſed, conduce towards anſwering the ſame Intention: And therefore I keep to theold Faſhion; and confeſs that I do not approve of the new one at all, and much leſs when carried to the Extremity to which M. *Voltaire* has been pleaſed to puſh it. And here let me once more mention that amiable and excellent Man (not ſoon to be forgotten by any of his old Acquaintance) the late good and learned Dr. *Byrom*; whoſe Thoughts and Words were uſed to flow with equal Facility and Correctneſs, and to whom Accuracy and Exactneſs were habitual: *His* Authority and Example would alone be ſufficient to juſtify an Adherence to the old Rule of beginning every material Subſtantive Noun with a *great* Letter. There ſeems to be no Reaſon for departing from an *eſtabliſhed* Cuſtom, in favour of a *new* Faſhion which has *no Advantage over it*.

I have already owned that I take my Cue of Pointing, from the *Subject-Matter*, from the *actual Pauſes* made in pronouncing the ſame Words, and more eſpecially from a View to *Perſpicuity*; as well as from *grammatical* Regard to the Words or Members of Sentences. Therefore, and alſo for the other Reaſon before hinted, my Habit of Pointing may differ ſomewhat from Dr. *Ward*'s: And, I ſuppoſe, every Man's differs, more or leſs, from every *other* Man's. In *one* Inſtance, the Method which I adopt muſt neceſſarily differ from any that takes its Rule from ſtrict *grammatical* Conſideration *only*. For, the *Grammar* may be exactly the *ſame*, and the *Words* as near as Words can be tranſlated; and yet they may bear a very different Pointing, in *Latin* and in *Engliſh:* Becauſe, in the *one* Language, the Senſe may be *clearly determined* by the different *Inflections* of the Caſes of Nouns; in the *other*, where there is no ſuch Inflection (except in the genitive Caſe,) the Senſe may be unclear or equivocal, as far as it can be caught from the *mere* Words; and therefore the *latter* may require a *higher* Pointing, in order to convey an inſtantaneous Direction to the Reader's Apprehenſion. I think I could give an Inſtance where the Pointing of theſe two Languages might differ ſo much, within the Compaſs of only two Lines, that perhaps a *ſingle Comma*, or two, or three at the utmoſt, would be ſufficient, for the *Latin*; though the *Engliſh* would *admit* of (I don't ſay *require*) *three Commas* and *four Semicolons:* I grant, that it would be very *high* Pointing; but, perhaps, not quite indefenſible. What I hint at, is the conciſe *Latin* Diſtich upon the

Louvre; which is ſaid to have been tranſlated into a more conciſe *Engliſh* one, for a Waget of a Crown.

" *Non Orbis Gentem neque Urbem Gens habet ulla,*
" *Urbsve Domum, Dominum nec Domus ulla parem.*"

" *The World no Nation has; no Nation, Town;*
" *Town, Houſe; Houſe, Lord; like this: Give me the Crown.*"

If my general *Poſition* is true (though my Example may be, and I think, is over-ſtrained,) it ſeems to follow, that the Rule of Pointing ought, not to be *confined* to the *mere grammatical Diviſion* of Sentences into their Parts and Members. Indeed, ſeveral of the learned Profeſſor's own Exceptions to his general Rules ſeem to *concede* that the Pointing *may admit* of ſome *Variety*, according to the *Degree of Perſpicuity* in the Sentence: Particularly, where he allows the Omiſſion of a Comma " *in brevioribus ſententijs*, quæ *adeo per* " *ſe manifeſtæ* ſunt, ut *nullam* diſtinctionem poſtulent; tum in lon- " gioribus, ubi interpunctorum multitudo nimis conferta *Confuſionem* " potius quam lucem pariat Orationi."

I have before confeſſed that I can not be entirely of this Gentleman's Sentiment with reſpect to the *Colon*; " *Cujus Explicatio*" (he himſelf agrees) " *paulo eſt difficilior.*" Perhaps, I may be whimſical or ſingular in the Uſe of it. The *Office* of the *Colon* does not ſeem to be yet fully ſettled. The main Uſe of it ſeems to me to be, Where two Subſtantive Sentences are put in Appoſition together, if I may ſo expreſs it; where each of them is a diſtinct Sentence of itſelf, and yet each is cloſely connected with the other; where the latter explains or inforces the former; where the firſt is a complete Sentence, both in Senſe and Grammar, and yet the ſecond naturally ariſes out of it and renders the Senſe of it *more* full and ſatisfactory. A *Colon* is alſo uſed with Propriety, where two Matters, or Characters, or Circumſtances are put in Oppoſition or Contraſt to each other. I uſe it indiſcriminately whether the Sentence be *long* or *ſhort*, or whether it has or has not a *Comma* or a *Semicolon* in it: As, for Example, I ſhould divide by a Colon, the two following very ſhort Sentences, though neither of them has any other Point of Diſtinction whatſoever in it; and my Reaſon is, becauſe I think the *Senſe* requires it, and a proportionable Pauſe would be *actually* made in *pronouncing* the Words. " *A. B.* is an exceedingly ſenſible Man: " But he is an infamous Scoundrel." " *C. D.* is come to Town: I " ſaw him this Morning." Perhaps, in rigid Strictneſs, it ſhould

never

never be uſed, but where *each* Part of the Diviſion is a perfect Grammatical Sentence, of itſelf. As, for Inſtance, it is not admiſſible in the following Sentence; becauſe the *ſecond* Part of the Diviſion of it is *not* a complete Grammatical Sentence.—"The Appendix may "be had by itſelf, ſeparate from the Book; a few ſupernumerary "Copies *having* been printed off, for that Purpoſe." Here, the former Part of the Diviſion is a complete Sentence of itſelf; but the *latter* Part of it has no Senſe or Meaning, without the Support of the former Part. But if the Sentence had been worded as follows, *then* indeed a Colon had been proper; becauſe *each* Part of the Diviſion *would* be a perfect Sentence.—"The Appendix may be had by it-"ſelf: A few ſupernumerary Copies *have* been printed off, for that "Purpoſe."

Upon *my* Principles, I can *neither admit the* REPETITION of a Colon in *one and the ſame* Period, how long ſoever it may be; nor *exclude* a Colon out of the ſhorteſt Sentence, *merely* for want of attendant *Commas* and *Semicolons*; nor *accede* to the *Introduction* of a Colon in the ſeveral Examples put by Dr. *Ward* in Pages 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, where the Sentences are *imperfect* and the Senſe *unfiniſhed*; nor, by any Means *approve* of it, as a Mark of the Beginning and the End of a *Quotation*, nor even of the Beginning of one.

Indeed the Example he has put in Page 58, gives me the Satisfaction of perceiving that my Notions concerning Pointing in general are not *abſolutely* diſſimilar to his. For he there ſingles out a particular Sentence, as an Example of *all* his Diviſions and Rules of Pointing, *in general*; ("*una ſententia ſingulorum exemplum dabimus:*") And I entirely *concur* with him in his Manner of pointing *that* Sentence. It is in *Latin*.—"*Ego certe neque petivi hunc honorem, vere-*"*cundia retardatus; neque merui, ætate deſtitutus: Tu tamen, am-*"*pliſſime Ordo, tanquam petenti confers, nequid negaſſe ei videare,*"*quem meruiſſe exiſtimas; tanquam merenti exſolvis, ut debuiſſe te*"*illi fateare, qui non petierat.*"

I will conclude the whole, with ſaying that it is enough for me, if I can ſatisfactorily *apologize* for my *own* Manner of Pointing, without pretending to preſcribe Rules to any *other* Perſon: And I ſhall be very thankful to any one who ſhall ſet me right, wherever I ſhall be found erroneous.

P. S. If any Gentleman is curious upon this Subject, I beg Leave to refer Him to Pages 45, 355, 356, and 393, of Biſhop Wilkins's Real Character; and alſo to the Second Volume of Joannis Clerici (Le Clerc's) Ars Critica, Chapter the tenth, "Diſtinctionum omiſſionem multa menda perperiſſe."

ERRATA.

Page 638. l. 14. For *Degree* of—read *Rank* of.
l. 24. For *Goſpel*—read *Epiſtle*.

Page 651. l. 3. For Gentem *neque*—read Gentem, *non*.

FINIS.